SMITH'S REPORT

Number 17 Spring 1994

Bradley R. Smith, Director
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust
Post Office Box 3267 Visalia, California 93278
Telephone: (209) 627 8757 Fax: (209) 733 2653

BACKSTAGE WITH PHIL DONAHUE -- WILLIS CARTO VERSUS IHR, ANDREW ALLEN & HIMSELF

***Smith's Report** now includes **Campus Update--for Editors. Update** is distributed free to the editors of 350 campus newspapers five times a year. For the first time, a revisionist connection is maintained with college and university newspapers. **Update** is also distributed free, with other background, to news and feature editors at 150 dailies, weeklies and monthlies.*

CODOH AD RUNS IN 35 COLLEGE PAPERS!

The CODOH advertisement challenging the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum to display proof that homicidal gassing chambers existed anywhere in Europe during World War II has appeared in at least 35 campus newspapers this academic year. We had no way to know in the fall that we would be so successful.

Here are the campuses where the Museum ad ran after my last listing here. U of Rhode Island (4 February), California State U at Chico (9 March), San Jose State U (9 March), Humbolt State U (CA, 16 March), American River College (CA, 17 March), Southern Illinois U (Carbondale, 7 April), U of Miami (12 April), SUNY-Oneonta NY (14 April), Trenton State U (14 [?] April), Manhattan College (Long Island, 14 April), SUNY-Buffalo (The Pipedream, 15 April), Clemson U (16 April), Columbia College (Chicago IL, 18 April), SUNY-Potsdam NY (19 April), Central Florida State U (20 April), U of Maine (20 April), Hofstra U (21 April).

Four SUNY (State University of New York) papers ran the ad at three campuses. The Record at SUNY-Buffalo started the year off when it ran the text of the ad as an opinion piece on 28 September. The Pipedream at SUNY-Buffalo ran it as a paid ad on 15 April.

I received a note from Clemson U saying The Tiger ran the text of the ad as a letter to the editor. In a new development, I have begun receiving communications from advertising and editorial staff at campus newspapers providing me with behind-the-scenes information about what went on at their papers during the controversy over the ad. What appears in print in the campus press is only the tip of the iceberg.

There may have been other publications of the ad that I have been unable to confirm. If you have information about the ad appearing or being discussed in the campus press, or anywhere else, please pass that information on to me.

MEDIA TRAIL TO THE PHIL DONAHUE SHOW

When the Museum ad ran on 7 December at **Brandeis University**, where the student body is about 75% Jewish, the resulting fuss got the attention of the prestige press and network media. That press led directly to my being interviewed by **Time** magazine and the full-page article on the Campus Project and Brandeis that ran in the issue of 27 December. While the **Time** article was amateurish and uninformed, it did introduce revisionism and CODOH to a national audience of tens of millions of readers!

The **Time** article convinced the producers for **Mike Wallace** that the Campus Project should play a significant part in a **60 Minutes** segment. When the segment did air, Wallace featured the Campus Project--he had to say that Bradley Smith had "declined to be interviewed on camera"--and **Ernst Zuendel**.

60 Minutes used archival footage from an old **48 Hours** interview to include me briefly in the segment, and used other archival material from an old **Montel Williams** interview to include **David Cole** (who had walked away from the segment with me) and **Mark Weber**. The archival footage was pretty well chosen and did not attempt to mislead the viewer, which rather surprised me. Nevertheless, when the full segment was aired (on 13 February), I was happy with our decision to walk away from the interview.

Ernst told me that while he had hoped for more he had gotten about what he'd expected from 60 Minutes. Three or four minutes air time culled from a 100-minute interview, camera work that was intended to make him appear menacing and untrustworthy, and a cut and paste job that denigrated his extensive knowledge of revisionist scholarship while presenting his point of view in an unflattering light. He wasn't complaining. "I knew I was going to be the sacrificial lamb," he told me. "I was prepared for it. But I have my own plan. We'll see who gets sacrificed in

the end."

While the Mike Wallace people were getting background for their segment on "revisionism," the editorial staff of the **Queens College Quad** on Long Island NY was wrestling with its conscience over whether to run the Museum ad or not. It's possible that the attention they were getting from the 60 Minutes camera team, which filmed the open debate by The Quad editors, influenced them to stand on principle. When The Quad ran the ad it was the first time I had broken through into print in the belly of the beast itself--New York City!

After walking away from the Wallace interview, we were apprehensive about getting another shot at network TV. Behind the scenes, however, the news of our having turned down Mike Wallace was flashing from one TV producer's office to another. Within ten days people for **The Phil Donahue Show** were on the horn to me. Brandeis, Time magazine, Queens College and the Mike Wallace affair, all tied into the Campus Project and the growing controversy over the Holocaust Museum, was just too scandalous a story for Donahue to overlook.

David and I did the Donahue interview on 14 February, a Monday afternoon. It was aired in some markets on one-hour delay, in secondary markets during the rest of that week, and on the 21st it was aired in major markets including New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and Miami.

On balance, it was a very successful interview for revisionism. Donahue noted at the outset that the Holocaust Museum and Simon Wiesenthal Center people all refused to participate. He screened several minutes' footage from David Cole's upcoming new video, **The Gas Chambers: A Look at the Physical Evidence**, while David did a voice-over to explain what was being viewed. The Zyklon-B staining in the *disinfestation* chambers showed up as a brilliant blue, while scenes from the interior of a Mauthausen "homicidal" gassing chamber were shown to be a pristine white. Many of the 8 to 13 *million* viewers may not have understood the significance of this footage, but tens and maybe hundreds of thousands did.

David grew frustrated with Donahue for allowing a photograph of a Dachau shower room to represent a homicidal gas chamber, and frustrated with professor Michael Shermer for trivializing the significance of revisionist research, and during the half-hour commercial break he walked off the show. David had pressed Donahue hard on air, the audience was largely Jewish, and when Donahue came on stage after the commercial and announced "we have lost David Cole," the audience cheered and clapped. When you see it on screen it's comic.

While I thought David had completed an interesting maneuver when he walked off the set, afterwards he apologized for leaving me on stage alone to face a hostile audience. In his frustration he hadn't thought about that part of it. But it was all the same to me. Events were moving fast and I had my hands full with six or eight women (some had their bad-tempered daughters with them) in the front row who were in my face on camera and especially off, showing me their tattoos and castigating me as only some of those old harridans can. But most everything I've done with this work in public I've done alone. I'm used to it. In that sense it was just another day for me.

Dr. Shermer felt differently. He was sweating like a lathered horse. Everyone was attacking me but Shermer was doing the sweating. It must be agony for a man like that when his wife is having a baby. Every time a commercial was aired the make-up woman had to run out, mop Shermer's brow and make him up again.

Now that David was backstage, he could report to me afterwards a little of what was going on off-camera. Donahue was shouting at his producer to prod Shermer into action to destroy the revisionists, which was the role he had been assigned to play in our little drama, but the producer couldn't get Shermer to act. On the one hand he was sweating and on the other he was frozen. Even the make-up woman was encouraging Shermer to "get" us. The professor did manage to say on air that the Jewish soap story is not true (in spite of the survivor in the front row who hadn't wanted to wash during her stay at Auschwitz because she hadn't wanted to risk using the remains of her mommy that way).

In the final minute, of what had become a raucous program, Donahue stated on network television that the revisionists can no longer be ignored and that their arguments must be addressed. Let's give credit where credit's due. Donahue is the first nationally recognized figure to have said it on network TV. Back home in Visalia I wrote him making that observation, and noting that he had stood on firm liberal principle --intellectual freedom--and that he should feel some satisfaction with that. I can only imagine some of the guff he was taking behind the scenes. It must have been spectacular.

When the show ended the producer suggested that David and I stay around and chat up the audience but I said I didn't think so. We left immediately, following our guide through a back passageway and outside to the waiting limousines. David and I barely had time to say goodby before he was off to the airport.

I was to stay another night. When I was dropped off at my hotel I walked over to First Avenue then started north toward Elaine's restaurant and bar. I was happy. I was laughing. I had just pulled off a real coup. A revisionist breakthrough at the national level. The interview had gone well enough. It could have been a disaster and it hadn't been--it had gone off really quite well. Moreover it had confirmed for me that I had been right about the audience. At this stage of the game the audience is in the way. We don't need to do anymore shouting at that collective brute. We need to find a way to get the other side to argue the evidence.

No more media interviews then that are not live. No media interviews with audience participation. Take it or leave it.

The Mike Wallace segment aired the night of 13 February. The Donahue Show with David and me ran the afternoon of the 14th. It was a one-two revisionist punch. When I contemplate what our friends with the ADL, Hillel, the AJC, WJC, SWC, etc. etc. were talking about Monday night, I can't keep a grin off my face. When I think about what they were saying about revisionism's Mr. Donahue, the grin does an evil jig.

WILLIS CARTO AND THE "PROBLEMS"

Last year when the Board of Directors of IHR (for those of you who are new, The Institute for Historical Review) decided to fire its founder, I had to make a decision just like everybody else. Despite the absolutely crucial role Willis Carto played in founding IHR, once

irreconcilable editorial differences arose between WC and the staff, I chose to go with the staff. More precisely, I chose to go with The Journal of Historical Review.

From the beginning, my association with IHR has been contingent on what is published in The Journal. For me, IHR *is* The Journal, a dozen or so books published by IHR, and the rallying point it provides for the handful of revisionist scholars and researchers who have contributed to them, and for those who have supported the endeavor financially or in other ways. But my association with IHR has always pivoted around the contents and editorial policies of The Journal.

I never committed myself to any personality connected with the Institute, but to the Institute as represented by its publications. I didn't commit myself to Tom Marcellus (Marcellus was director in July 1984 when the Institute was burned to the ground in an arson attack, which was the event that propelled me into offering my services to the Institute) or any other director before or after Marcellus, or to Willis Carto. When I decided to associate myself with the Institute I didn't know Tom well and I didn't know Willis at all. As a matter of fact, I still don't know Willis.

My understanding of my loyalties and responsibilities toward revisionism and the Institute are the same today as they were ten years ago. I'll stand with The Journal so long as it publishes valuable revisionist research on the holocaust controversy, and I'll stop representing it when it becomes a forum for other interests.

While I've never been on staff at IHR, over the years I have come to know most of those associated with it in any meaningful way. In all those years there has never been a time when staff did not expend much of its energies in resisting WC's editorial influence. There has never been an editor for The Journal who did not have to struggle day by day, month after month all these years against what they have regarded as WC's psychological and intellectual vagaries.

McCalden, Stimely, Hoffman, Berkel, O'Keefe and Weber. Every one of them struggled against WC to maintain the intellectual integrity of The Journal. In the end each quit in disgust, or was fired, with the exception of Weber, who it appears Carto was preparing to try to get fired when he was fired himself.

The vulgarity and carelessness of Carto's intellectual style is represented by his national weekly, The Spotlight. It was always a commonplace at the Institute that if WC's editorial and intellectual sensibilities were ever to be successful, The Journal would become "another Spotlight," intellectually cheap, untrustworthy, the political tool of a single personality. I'm not saying The Spotlight runs no worthwhile stories, or that it has no place in the newspaper world. It does. But it's "another" world. It isn't mine. And it isn't the world of any revisionist scholar or researcher who wants his work to be taken seriously.

All of us who were privy to the struggle for editorial control of The Journal understood it was a life and death struggle for its intellectual integrity--against its founder.

Unlike those few supporters of IHR whose first loyalty is to Willis Carto, mine is to the Institute represented primarily by The Journal. Revisionist scholarship plays a key role in the struggle for intellectual freedom in America. The Journal is more important to me than Willis, and more important than any individual employed to edit it. If I were to conclude that the editor of The Journal had begun to compromise it, even if he were my friend, I would back the search for a new editor. I understand I don't have the ability to edit the Journal. I would not think it dishonorable to reach the same conclusion about a friend, if such were the case.

Loyalty to a friend does not imply to me that I should pretend my friend can perform a task he cannot, or that I should stand aside while he contributes to the dissolution of an institution I believe is necessary. I have no obligation to my friend and his ideals that he does not have toward me and mine.

So when it was time to decide between WC and the Journal, I chose The Journal hands down. It was no contest. My only regret is that it took so long for the time to come.

W. CARTO VS. ANDREW ALLEN

On 1 March I received a note from Willis stating in part, "I'm not sure if the facts are important to you, but if your mind is not totally closed and perhaps [you] even have some questions, why don't you ask me?"

I responded, admitting that I had failed to ask him for his side of the story but that I was certainly ready and willing to listen to it. Meanwhile, IHR had sent out a mailing with quotes from six well-known revisionists along with their photos, each, without mentioning Willis, endorsing the current staff of IHR. The six included Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz, David Irving, James J. Martin, Ernst Zuendel and myself.

In addition to endorsing the staff, I am quoted addressing the charge Willis is making in The Spotlight against my friend, Andrew Allen. Willis is charging that Allen works for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and that because he is a member of the "new" IHR board of directors, the ADL now controls and runs IHR. My statement addresses this specific charge only. In it I promise that if it is ever demonstrated that Andrew Allen is an agent for the ADL, I will fly to Washington, call a press conference, and eat my shorts on the steps of Liberty Lobby (the parent company of The Spotlight).

A couple weeks later I received Willis's reply to my inquiry about his side of the story. It was a little package of canned materials that is sent to anyone who writes The Spotlight asking for it. There was a one-sentence penned note from Willis. "The next time you come to Washington," it read, "I suggest you wear clean shorts."

When I'm drinking beer I might think a crack like that is uproarious. I might even *make* a crack like that and slap my leg too. But Willis can do *better*. One day four or five years ago I got a note from Willis out of the blue. "I have good news for you," it read. "Your friend David McCalden is dying of AIDS." Now *there's* a funny line. We weren't even having an exchange of correspondence, Willis and me, yet he had taken the time to sit down, write and fold the note, address the envelope, put the note in it, lick it closed, stamp it and see that it got mailed.

At the time, I didn't have it in me to laugh at the news. Sometimes I'm just not at my best. As a matter of fact, when I read the note, I felt something terrible surge through my innards. Now that McCalden's death is well behind me and my too-easily touched sensibilities have relaxed about his demise, I can better appreciate WC's sense of the comic.

I am not amused, however, by WC's charge that my friend Andrew Allen is a mole for the ADL. When I got Willis's

package I looked for what proof he has in it to substantiate the charge. The matter is addressed on page (panel) seven of Vince Ryan's "Regarding the IHR Controversy."

According to Ryan, who is editor of The Spotlight and in this instance WC's mouthpiece, after the Carto/McCalden split in 1980, McCalden began to collaborate with Roy Bullock, an ADL undercover agent. Ryan writes that Bullock was McCalden's "handler," financing and directing him, while Andrew Allen collaborated closely with both McCalden "and Bullock."

Two years ago The San Francisco Chronicle exposed Bullock as a paid informant for the ADL. That much is true. But Ryan/WC present no proof whatever that Bullock was McCalden's "handler," that he financed or directed McCalden, and [my particular interest here] no proof that Andrew Allen "collaborated" with Bullock or that he even knew Bullock. As a matter of fact, Allen says he never met Bullock and doesn't recall ever hearing Bullock's name until Bullock was outed by The Chronicle last year.

That is, either Andrew Allen is not telling me the truth, or WC's charges against him are untrue. How can this difficult impasse be broken? All WC has to do is publish proof that Allen is an ADL agent. It's not complicated. WC should have presented such proof when he published the allegation. That would have been the honorable thing to do. That would have been an act of integrity. Since he didn't, I'm going to speculate that WC has no proof for the allegation. That WC has decided to smear Andrew Allen to further his struggle to regain his authority with IHR., and that his charges are a mix of speculation and slander, a bucket of Carto spit.

I don't ask Willis to do anything about his accusations against Andrew Allen that revisionists do not ask Jews and others to do with respect to their accusations about Germans using gassing chambers--put up or shut up. Either Willis Carto has proof that Andrew Allen is a mole for the ADL or Willis Carto is a slanderer. The ball's in his court.

If Willis does publish information that substantiates his charges against Andrew Allen, you will have gotten an interesting insight into my credulity, my misplaced sense of friendship, and my unworthiness of being trusted or respected by those who represent and support The Institute for Historical Review.

If Willis does not publish the facts proving that Andrew is an ADL mole, you will understand something of his intellectual vulgarity, the crudeness of his sensibilities under pressure, and much of what you need to know about why he should have been excised from any relationship with IHR and The Journal years ago.

WILLIS CARTO VS. HIMSELF

Willis is four or five years older than me, he must be nearing seventy now, and the end of his life is approaching. It's time for him to take stock of how he relates to people, how he treats those who work with him, to ask forgiveness here and there, to get a grip on his real life, to put something before what he is putting first now.

I would urge Willis to come clean about the "Edison" bequest of millions of dollars, which court documents and WC's own sworn statements make clear was left to IHR but which has apparently been diverted to private and even secret accounts controlled by Willis. If he doesn't come clean about the money, he's never going to be able to clean up his life. I don't know if he is able to understand an idea like this one, but I wish him well, and I urge him to contemplate the fact that his time is about to come, and that he's only going to have one chance to do it right.

THE CAMPUS PROJECT IN PRESS CLIPPINGS

We have some 150 pages of press clippings produced by the Campus Project this academic year. We're putting together a portfolio of these press stories. I suppose it will cost about $15 each to have them copied, packaged and mailed. Those of you who have helped with the Project this season will receive the portfolio in June. We'll send it to you for a contribution of $20 (or more?).

Just as a $288 advertisement might cost a university $2-million (reported below by The Hurricane at U of Miami) the ads in their totality have produced many millions of dollars worth of public notice for revisionism. In the last three years holocaust revisionism has become part of our cultural landscape. The Campus Project is responsible for most of it. At the same time, I am under no illusion that we can simply repeat next academic year what we we did this. There has to be a new approach--and there will be. The wheels for it are already in motion. A lot of people on the other side are going to be taken aback. You're going to like it. A lot!

Best wishes,

Brad

The Miami Hurricane 13 April 1994

Cries of betrayal greet running of Holocaust ad

Students have right to be wrong, UM provost says

By FRANCES ROBLES
Herald Staff Writer

Luis Glaser stood before a throng of angry Jews who saw him as the traitor among them.

As provost of the University of Miami, he had the unenviable task on Tuesday of explaining to 200 protesting students why the administration didn't veto a student newspaper ad that questioned proof that the Holocaust occurred.

Glaser's argument: academic freedom.

Across town at an enormous Key Biscayne condo overlooking the ocean, millionaire Sanford L. Ziff got more than 100 phone calls congratulating him as a hero who stood up for Jews.

A philanthropist with deep pockets, Ziff felt it was his job to let UM suffer the consequences for permitting the ad to run Tuesday. The day before, the Sunglass Hut founder had withdrawn a pledged $2 million donation to UM's Lowe Art Gallery and its Sylvester Cancer Research Center.

All over a $288 quarter-page ad.

The two men are Jews on different sides of a stormy issue: Whether UM administrators should have allowed student editors at The Miami Hurricane to run an ad that questions whether the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum offers any proof that Jews were gassed during World War II.

It was placed by Bradley R. Smith, a 64-year-old California writer who places ads in student papers around the country.

The drama climaxed Tuesday at UM, when hun-

Smith's Report is published six times a year and sent free to those who help with contributions, relevant press clippings or in other ways. I welcome correspondence and read it all, but [forgive me] can not respond unless it address urgent business to hand.

Your generosity is the cornerstone of whatever progress I will continue to make in having revisionist research judged on its merits.

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO

Bradley R. Smith
PO Box 3267 Visalia CA 93278
Tel/Fax: (209) 733 2653

SMITH'S REPORT

Number 18 Fall 1994

Bradley R. Smith, Director
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust
Post Office Box 3267 Visalia, California 93278
Tel: (209) 627 8757 Fax: (209) 733 2653 Email: BradleyRS@aol.com

THE CAMPUS PROJECT, ELISABETH CARTO ON THE "PROBLEMS," A WEEKLY REVISIONIST PROGRAM ON TALK RADIO

__Smith's Report__ summarizes the work I'm doing, with the help of friends and supporters, to promote open debate on the Holocaust controversy. It looks as if SR is beginning to comment as well on some of the behind-the-scenes goings-on that is stressing revisionism at the moment. __Smith's Report__ is now supplemented by Campus Update--for Editors. Sometimes the two newsletters will appear together, sometimes separately. This issue of SR appears by itself.

CAMPUS PROJECT FOR 1993/94 SEASON TREMENDOUS SUCCESS

In *__Smith's Report__ #17* I noted that our CODOH ad challenging the U.S. Holocaust Museum in Washington to exhibit proof that homicidal gassing chambers existed anywhere in Europe during World War II had run in student newspapers at 35 colleges campuses around the country. I thought it was over for the summer. But the challenge has now run a total of 38 times.

State University of New York (SUNY) at Oneota, SUNY at Oswego and SUNY at Stony Brook. That makes a total of six (!) SUNY campuses where the ad was run. Buffalo (twice! In The Record last September and in The Pipedream in April), Oneota, Oswego, Binghamton, Potsdam and Stony Brook. It's as if the tremendous ruckus raised at Brandeis University over publication of the ad in The Brandeis Justice in December affected SUNY editors in a way that could not have been expected by The Lobby.

Of the six SUNY colleges that ran the ad, the background to publication in The Stony Brook Statesman is particularly interesting. Back in January, at the same time The Queens College Quad editorial board was wrestling with its conscience over running the ad, and a crew for Mike Wallace at 60 Minutes was filming the debate (in the end The Quad did run the ad, but David Cole and I decided to not do the Wallace interview)--at the same time the editorial board at The Statesman at Stony Brook, after considerable debate, decided to *not* run the ad. I thought the Stony Brook story was over.

Toward the end of May I received a phone call from one of The Statesman editors asking permission to run the text of the ad as an opinion piece. Why had the editors changed their minds? It was the summer session, the editorial board had lost a few members and gained a few and the new editors had decided the responsible thing for them to do as journalists would be to run the ad that had been suppressed by the previous editors.

I was pleased, of course, but when I got the issue of The Statesman (6 June) in which the ad was printed as an opinion piece, I was surprised to see that The Statesman had run my open letter to student editors as well. The editors had printed my open letter giving the reasons why the ad should be run, and following it they'd run the text of the ad itself. (See page 3 for the full text of the letter.)

Packet of Press Clippings. In the last issue of ***SR*** I noted that I was putting together all the press clippings that the Project had produced during the 1993/94 campaign. All those I could get my hands on. I wrote they might ad up to 150 pages of clippings and cost about $15 to print and ship.

Last week, a five or six weeks late, I put the packet together. It contains some ***330 pages*** of clippings and costs about $21 to print and ship. On 20 August I began shipping the packets to those of you who helped substantially with The Project this last season. If you have helped substantially and haven't received the packet, contact me and remind me that I owe it to you. I want you to have it. When you see everything together it's pretty impressive.

For those of you who are new, or for your own reasons could not or did not support the Campus Project last season, $21 will cover the cost of sending it to you. Your donation above that amount will be used to good effect. Contributions are the life blood of the Campus Project.

ADL to Publish Handbook for College Editors on How to Contain the Campus Project? A reader in Michigan reports that such is the case. He read the story in a Jewish Newspaper. If any of you get your hands on this booklet, if it exists, I would very much like to have a copy. (I have now been told that the ADL booklet has indeed been published, but I have yet to see a copy.)

The New Paperback Edition of Deborah Lipstadt's *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory* (Penguin, NY), contains a new preface by the author. In the original hardback edition Deborah dedicated one complete chapter to the Campus Project which she called "The Battle for the Campus."

Her preface to the paperback edition Professor Lipstadt expresses her concern with revisionist success in reaching radio and TV. By and large, she's talking about me. It's the Campus Project which draws the media to revisionism, and to me as a spokesman for IHR and CODOH.

"The deniers' window of opportunity will be enhanced in years to come. The public, particularly the uneducated public, will be increasingly susceptible to Holocaust denial as survivor die."

So here the professor is troubled that we might be successful with the great unwashed, uneducated public, for they are the ones primarily who listen to talk radio and watch tabloid TV.

But soon her preface turns into an essay on the success, and danger, of revisionism on the campus (me again). That is, revisionism on radio and TV put the "uneducated public" at risk of beginning to doubt the Holocaust story, while revisionism on campus threatens belief in The Story among our intellectual elites. For Professor Lipstadt the Campus Project is a double whammy, a two-headed monster, a giant pincer movement attacking from below and above, from in front and behind, from this side and that.

When I run the ads in student newspapers it puts student and even academic beliefs about the Holocaust controversy at risk. Media picks up on the hullabaloo they make over it, which then puts the beliefs of the great unwashed masses at risk.

What's the poor lady to do?

The Two Most Disruptive Influences in our Society Today: a reader writes that he was watching a conference sponsored by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) over C-Span on 13 March when a lady speaker announced to the gathering that "The two most disruptive influences in our society today are Louis Farrakhan and Bradley Smith."

What do I make of this? First, it makes me laugh happily. Second, I don't believe it. I think the lady who made the observation is unusually neurotic, even for the circle she travels in. But I'm flattered. I'm as disruptive as *Farrakhan?* Farrakhan travels all over the country drawing ten and twenty thousand people to listen to him rave; I can't even get booked. He runs a national organization with tens of thousands of members and hangers-on, has body guards to baby-sit him, plays the violin and lives in a mansion. I don't have squat and can't play the violin either.

But I'm flattered by my friend at AIPAC mentioning me and Farrakhan in the same breath. Farrakhan has the sweetest smile of any rabble rouser who has ever appeared in public. I feel it's always a *mitzvah* to be associated publicly with the good or the beautiful, either one.

***SKEPTIC* Magazine**, edited by Professor Michael Shermer of Occidental College in Pasadena CA, has run a special 43-page section on "Pseudohistory." Dr. Shermer was the little fellow who appeared with David Cole and me on The Donahue Show. He told David afterwards it was the worst experience of his life.

A headline on the cover of this issue of *SKEPTIC* reads: "Who Says The Holocaust never Happened? And Why Do They Say It?" You might be able to guess who the "who" is, and you might be able to guess "why" they say it. They're "racists" and they say it because they're "racists."

The issue includes three major articles on The Controversy, including the lead article by Shermer titled "Proving the Holocaust: The Refutation of Revisionism & the Restoration of History." The article heading alone gives you the drift of what's coming (what does it mean to "restore" history?). If there is some value in what Shermer has put together here it must be in that his magazine reaches one of revisionism's prime potential audiences--**skeptics**. In the event, Dr. Shermer doesn't appear to be skeptical about anything having to do with The Story.

David Cole played the major revisionist role in bringing Dr. Shermer into The Controversy. They both are associated with atheist-libertarian-skeptic circles, one thing led to another and Cole and Shermer spent a lot of time talking revisionism. Early this year when both the Mike Wallace and Phil Donahue people were talking to me, Dr. Shermer called me up to see if he couldn't be included someplace on the TV roster. I cooperated, put him in touch with producers for both shows, and as it fell out he did Donahue.

Shermer appeared to me to be personable and someone who "gets things done." What dismayed me a little was that the first time Shermer rang me up he volunteered that he is not "Jewish." He said it in a way that caused me to sense that he felt I would be more willing to cooperate and even help him if I understood he isn't Jewish. As a matter of fact, depending on the situation, that might not be true. Nevertheless, I was a little taken aback by a professor of history introducing himself to me in that way.

Another few moments into our conversation Dr. Shermer volunteered for the second time that he is not Jewish. This time I felt considerable discomfort, and I began to not trust him. Why was he acting in a way that was so obvious? It was deeply unprofessional of him and insulting to me. I have since come to suppose that the reason behind his inappropriate behavior might be -- he's Jewish! Am I being cynical?

Aside from all that, if you have an interest in how The Controversy is beginning to play out in alternative intellectual magazines, this issue (VOL. 2 NO.4) of *SKEPTIC* will probably interest you. (Send $6 + $3 for p&h to SKEPTIC, 2761 N. Marengo Ave., Altadena, CA 91001.)

(This is the text of the letter that ran in The Statesman *at the State University of New York at Stony Brook (Long Island.)*

Dear Campus Editor:

Today I submitted an advertisement to your paper that challenges the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum to provide proof of its assertion that the Germans used homicidal "gassing chambers" to murder European Jews during World War II.

A representative of Hillel, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) or some other mainline Jewish organization may have contacted your advertising department, your administration, or you, charging that running the ad would encourage "hate" and urging your paper to suppress it.

The assertion that it is hateful to challenge an historical orthodoxy, in this instance the alleged gas chambers, is both easy and difficult to respond to. It's easy, because if you will read the text of the ad with an open mind, without fear, and with your professional ideals clearly before you, you will see for yourself that the ideas expressed in the ad, while controversial, will not encourage hatred of others but a free exchange of ideas.

On the other hand, it's difficult to respond to a charge of inciting hate when Hillel/ADL representatives, for example, will not point to any specific statement in the ad that is "hateful." They won't commit themselves to charging that even one specific word is hateful. The essence of their argument is, simply, that it is hateful to challenge what they believe, what they insist *you* believe!

All my life I have seen Jews lead the struggle to maintain a free press and intellectual freedom in America. In the 1960s, when I was a book dealer, on Hollywood Boulevard in Los Angeles I was arrested, tried and convicted for selling a book then banned by the U.S. Government--Henry Miller's *Tropic of Cancer*, which today is shelved in every library of note in America--Jews from every walk of life supported my fight against Government censorship. A.L. Wiren, head of the Los Angeles chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union, offered his offices for my defense at no cost to me. After my conviction, when the case went to appeal, Stanley Fleishman offered his services to me *pro bono*! Fleishman didn't take my case because he considered Henry Miller to be the greatest writer who ever lived. He took it because he was committed heart and soul--and mind--to the ideals of intellectual freedom and the *spirit* of the First Amendment.

Today, however, mainline Jewish organizations have reversed direction and committed themselves to the suppression and censorship of open research on one historical controversy--the "Holocaust". What this amounts to is nothing less than a *Jewish onslaught against intellectual freedom*.

On every campus in America where there is a substantial number of Jewish students, the Hillel organization (the campus arm of the B'nai B'rith, usually led by a rabbi) leads the attack against free inquiry and open debate on the Holocaust controversy. I am astounded that Jewish intellectuals and scholars stand idly by while the reputation of Jews as free thinkers is everywhere corrupted, diminished and burlesqued by a handful of organized Jewish extremists and censors.

Student editors who are Jewish are under special pressure from the Holocaust Lobby to betray their ideals as journalists and to betray as well the long tradition of intellectual liberty for which Jews have worked all over the world. Jewish editors are attacked ferociously, not only by spokespersons for organized Jewry off campus, but also on campus by well-meaning but unsophisticated Jewish students egged on by Hillel rabbis who function as semi-professional censors.

Student editors who are not Jewish, while they experience all the above, must face the additional burden of being slandered as "antisemites" and "haters." I understand why many are unwilling or even afraid to shoulder the burden that the ideal of a free press places on journalists with regard to the Holocaust controversy. Yet without a free press there are no universities worthy of the name, no government that is not tyrannical, and no society that is not a burden on the lives of its citizens.

The issue here is not ethnicity or religious identity. The issue is intellectual freedom. *Weighing evidence is not a hate crime*, no matter what Hillel or the ADL says about it. Saying what you think about a museum *is not a hate crime!* And charging that it is hateful to doubt what others sincerely believe is infantile, particularly on a university campus. I can only wonder at the real motives of those who would try to convince you otherwise.

Your university was created as a place for you to think--freely and honestly. You don't need permission from slanderers and special interest groups to think for yourself. Even about the "Holocaust." Whatever else the Holocaust was, it was an *historical event*. It's all right to weigh the evidence for and against the gas chambers. Historical events can be questioned. Museums dedicated to promoting historical orthodoxies can be assessed. *It's all right!*

Thirty-odd years have passed since I was a bookseller on Hollywood Boulevard, but my conviction about the fundamental importance of intellectual freedom is the same today as it was then. In the 1960s I went to court and was ready to go to jail to uphold the right of students to read radical literary works. I am no less convinced today that students have the *right* to read any research paper that interests them, on any historical controversy whatever, including *every single word ever written about the Holocaust controversy!*

I ask you, simply, to read the text of my ad without pre-judging it, think for yourself, and act on your conscience.

Regards,

Bradley Smith

Note: If your advertising department rejects the Museum ad, feel free to run the text as an opinion piece. If you want to run this letter as an opinion piece, you have permission to do so. Neither is copyrighted. If you do run either, please send me a tear sheet.

Thanks.

THE "PROBLEMS" IHR STAFF / THE CARTOS

The Problems resulting from the Staff at IHR divorcing its founder, Willis Carto, continue, to the detriment of all, which has always been a concern for all. It's not possible for me to stand aside from the fallout entirely, and not right that I try. I have a responsibility toward those of you who support my work to report honestly how I view the on-going debate. At the same time, I don't want to get lost in the sea of innuendo, rumor, slurs and slander and all the rest of it. I'll do what I can with the space and time I have.

In the Fall 94 issue of this Report I expressed my dismay and annoyance that Willis Carto would accuse Andrew Allen of being an agent for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith who has a goal of destroying IHR from within. If Carto had even attempted to provide us with proof that the charge is true, that would have been one thing. But he didn't.

He did what slanderers do. They throw their unproven and unprovable charges out where they will cause the most confusion, the most dissension, and just let them lay.

I didn't try to convince you that Allen is not an agent for the ADL (now The Spotlight is publishing charges that Allen is a "Mossad" agent), or that he is not working to destroy the Institute from the inside. I can't prove those kinds of negatives. I simply asked that Willis put what proof he has for his charges against Allen on the table where we can all have a look at them. He's put no proof on the table. That fact alone suggests to me he has none. In any event, why should anyone at all believe the charges if they can not be demonstrated to be true?

Elisabeth Carto. I've known Elisabeth about as long as I've known Willis, but haven't known her even as well as I've known Willis, which was that we were acquainted and crossed paths on average perhaps once a year. While I knew she had long been dissatisfied with my work for the Institute, she was nevertheless always friendly and decent toward me personally.

Oftentimes when I was hanging out with staff in IHR offices or we were having lunch or a beer someplace and someone was complaining about Willis doing everything wrong here or everything wrong there, I'd throw in something about how seeing that he'd been married to the same intelligent beautiful woman for 30 years he must be doing *something* right.

A couple weeks after I mailed out ***Smith's Report # 17***, I received a response from Elizabeth Carto in the form of a one-page typed letter. I'm not sure what the line across the top signifies, "A personal letter from Elisabeth Carto to Bradley Smith, June 22nd 1994," but her letter is her response to my article in ***ST #17,*** there is no privileged information about either herself or her husband in it, and because its tone demonstrates a certain something about both, and because it addresses a number of issues that stand between the two sides in The Problems, and because it covers a lot of ground in a few words, and because I suppose it is precisely the "information" and the slurs that she and her husband repeat to others, I'm reproducing it for your information.. The letter is signed Elisabeth Carto in blue ink which may or may not reproduce well. I've reproduced the letter in full on the opposite page.

My Response.

Paragraphs 1 thru 3: no response, but I like the way they reveal the "tone" this intelligent and educated woman chooses to use.

Paragraph 4: it's true of course that I have friends at IHR. It's true that over the years I talked to O'Keefe more than any of the others and that I have been closest to him.

It's true I have no right to any "so-called" legacy.

The suggestion that I never attended an editorial conference is true. I never worked at IHR offices, I was never part of The Journal's staff, and was never asked to be a member of The Journal's editorial advisory board. I also did not help write the Bill of Rights but I stand by the ideal of a free press.

Paragraph 5: it's true that Mermelstein brought his second suit against IHR because of (true) statements I wrote in the IHR Newsletter while I was its editor. It's true Willis never scolded me over the suit. Did Willis "pay" for anything related to the ensuing trial? I doubt it. Who will every know? I think Elisabeth writes here under the mistaken idea that Willis and IHR are one and the same thing. They are not.

Re the remarks about me and Henry Miller, I have no response (I do refer to this period in my life however in the letter to Campus Editors reprinted here on page three and published in The Statesman at SUNY Stony Brook.), other than to note that the language, sadly, appears to represent the sensibilities of its author.

Paragraph 6--the Heart of the Matter! The charge that Andrew Allen is my friend is true.

It's true that Allen was refused admittance to IHR conferences because he represented David McCalden *pro bono* in a censorship suit against the City of Los Angeles. David and Willis were wrangling like children and Allen got caught in the middle.

Regarding all the allegations of intrigue here, I'll let time sort them out. There is literally no end to those kinds of charges, innuendos, suggestions, speculation etc., etc.

"We all know without a doubt, that [Allen] was the replacement of ADL chief spy, Roy Bullock." [see SR #17]

No, Elisabeht, we don't know that. That, precisely, is the rub. What demonstrable proof is on the table proving Allen is an ADL agent? None. Willis Carto has not provided us with any, and now that I've heard from you I see you have none either. So, while there is "no doubt" that Allen is a spy, there is "no proof" of it either. That's the long and short of this bitter little affair.

Everyone can play the Carto game. It's called conspiracy mongering. No one will ever be able to prove that Andrew Allen is *not* an ADL spy, just as none of us can prove that at this moment the CIA is *not* exterminating Jews in secret homicidal gassing chambers. How can I prove they aren't? I can't even prove that I myself am not an ADL spy. Where does it all end?

One of my supporters is convinced that Willis Carto himself is an agent for the "other side." Why? He finds it impossible

A personal letter from Elisabeth Carto to Bradley Smith, June 22nd 1994

Dear Bradley:

(1) I just read your latest diatribe and frankly, I am not astounded at all, knowing you to be a man of very little principles.

(2) While you were literally starving, living off your poor old mother's pension and breeding children of doubtful ancestry, Willis saw to it that you were put to work and paidhandsomely compared to the results of your radio endeavors for IHR.

(3) Very rarely did you even manage to get the address of the IHR on the air. I always cringed when I had to issue a check for you since we at IHR were ourselves surviving from day to day after the 1984 fire and the Berkel debacle. I have always considered you a typical libertarian: take the money from the suckers and run!

(4) WEll, you won't be running with any money from a so-called legacy that you seem to have your eyes and thoughts on. You simply have no right to any of it, not even indirectly throughyour like-to-be beneficiary friend Ted O'Keefe. He hopes to retire soon with generous pension benefits from a nebulous source. Contrary to your written protestations, you do have friends and cohorts at the IHR and you do have special loyalties to them. You are not just interested in the content of the JOURNAL (how many editorial conferences did you ever attend), as you write. This statement of yours is hilarious or is it just another of your many lies? You and Ted held daily telephone conversations for manyyears. He resented it when he was asked to pay them although they were private, non-business calls.

(5) You,Bradley, are a disgusting ingrate. You also always were a loose cannon. Remember your big mouth which got us into the second Mermelstein suit? You alone arranged for that. Who paid for this indiscretion of yours? Willis Carto did, he covered for you, paid the legal bills and never uttered one work of criticism of your actions. Maybe you wish to forget your part in that disasterous affair, I have not. It cost IHR dearly. Perhaps we should have got rid of YOU then? Where would you be now? Back on sleazy HollywoodBoulevard, peddling the filthy books of Henry Miller for a living as you told me you had in the past.

(6) So, Andrew Allen is your friend too, I thought he just belonged to the mutt Weber. What a privilege it seems to be to claim this man as a friend, a man who was not even allowed into our revisionist conferences but was told by Tom Marcellus in my hearing that he could not attend. We all knew without a doubt, that he was the replacement of ADL chief spy, Roy Bullock. He supported and financed McCalden , your sicko friend for close to ten years.(Are you sure you want to claim McCalden too?) Allen did this while McCalden was attacking Willis and IHR viciously, even suing IHR at one point. Perhaps your friend Allen gavefree legal advice to him too? Why did he support a destructive entity like McCalden for so long? Why his intrigue against Willis for so many years? Why his major part in the present IHR take-over? Was it perhaps because the IHR was too succesful under WAC's leadership? Was not Bullock doing an ADL job too? Maybe he was your friend too, who knows. He sat openly with McCalden the hotel lobbies where we held our conferences when we would let either of them in the meeting. When the Bullock story broke in the SF papers, Willis asked mutt Weber to run a short item in the JOURNAL which Weber refused at first. He actually said to us"How do you know Bullock is an ADL agent?" Do you, Bradley, believe that the ADL does not have an agent presently in the revisonist movement in a position to do harm? Even you can't be that stupid. I would change my friends if I were you and start looking for a real job soon. YOur associations will become an embarassment to you, Allen will be exposed in good time and he knows it too. The destruction of the IHR will proceed as planned since April 1993 and you are a part of it.

Elisabeth Carto

to believe that Carto is so politically and culturallty stupid that he would have facilitated Liberty Lobby and Spotlight to support the David Duke campaign for President, to give only one of numerous possible examples. He can't believe that Willis, being listed as "founder" of The Institute, could be so stupid he did not understand the immense negative fallout such support would have for The Institute, for revisionism in general, and for all of us working to make revisionism perceived to be a respectable field of study.

And there's the fact that Willis displayed no interest whatever in backing the Campus Project with the significant resources available to him. How else, my friend argues, can it be explained that the most successful revisionist project ever initiated, a national campaign taking revisionism to hundreds of thousands and perhaps several millions of the most educated and influential Americans alive today, has to be handled by one man working out of his garage with the help of only a part-time secretary? Willis (and his wife?) then must be paid agents of those Jewish institutions dedicated to destroying revisionism.

I've gotten some of the best laughs of my life listening to the perfectly logical reasoning of this man about how Willis Carto must be an agent for the Holocaust Lobby because he can't be so stupid as his actions make him out to be. But I don't believe Willis is an agent for The Lobby, and I know he's not stupid. His agenda, whatever it is, is simply not the agenda of The Institute for Historical Review. That's the underlying reason why it was necessary to fire him.

"Do you, Bradley, believe that the ADL does not have an agent presently in the revisionist movement in a position to do harm?" It's perfectly possible. I don't know. So what? If I ever receive any information about such an agent, I will go straightaway with it to The Institute. But that isn't the charge being made.

The charge being leveled is that a *particular individual* is an ADL agent. What proof does Elisabeth have that *Andrew Allen* is an ADL agent? That's the dirty accusation being made by the Cartos. If they can demonstrate the accusation is true, I'm all ears. If they can't, they have involved themselves in something that is dirty or paranoid or both.

And with regard to the "revisionist movement," what the hell is that? Who makes up this movement? Am I part of it? I never joined any so-called movement. Does this "movement" have a political agenda? If so, what it is it? If it has no political agenda, in what way is it a movement? In any event, the so-called revisionist movement and The Institute for Historical Review are not synonymous.

My work is to help create a public arena in which revisionist theory can become part of ordinary public discourse. That does not make me part of a movement.

Well, when my friend gets onto the subject of Willis being an undercover agent for the Jewish lobbies, it never fails to get me started on a big laugh. Nevertheless, I have no more proof that Willis is an agent representing those who want to destroy revisionism than Willis has that Allen is. The difference between us is that I'm not making that filthy accusation.

"Allen will be exposed in good time." For myself, this is a good time. What's wrong with right now, Elisabeth?

Three Important Questions and Answers about the Coup d' Etat at the IHR by Willis Carto. This is the title of a 4-page letter Willis is circulating to interested parties.

CARTO QUESTION #1) asks if Carto was fired from IHR as the result of a "*coup*." Carto says he was.

I agree. IHR staff took over The Institute by means of a *coup*. That's how these things are done. The director of the board becomes, or is seen to have become, a liability to the corporation, board members or others look for a way to relieve the director of his responsibilities, the director works to fight off the challenge and either succeeds or fails. I used to read about these machinations 50 years ago in John C. Marquand novels. In the event, the original board of directors, which was in Willis's pocket, resigned rather than face a legal challenge from staff, a new board was appointed, Willis was fired as "agent" for the board, and now he's whining about it.

CARTO QUESTION #2) How do the "conspirators" attempt to justify their actions?

Willis writes that the primary justification is "money ... an alleged estate left to the IHR ... They simply believed I had lots of money squirrled away and wasn't sharing enough of it with them; they wanted it all ...."

"Incidentally, I believe they now have concluded, correctly, that no such cash cache exists ...."

IHR has concluded no such thing, and in fact is suing Willis Carto and others to gain access to the "alleged" estate left to IHR that Willis would like you to believe *never existed!* Maybe he will pretend the suit against him doesn't exist either but if you want to find out the truth of the matter you can check with the SAN DIEGO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT, NORTH COUNTY DISTRICT, 325 So. Melrose, Suite 100, Vista, California 92083.

The suit involving what Carto calls the "alleged" estate was filed on July 22 1994. The Case Number is N64584. The Notice To Defendant reads:

The LEGION FOR THE SURVIVAL OF FREEDOM, INC., [IHR & Noontide Press] a Texas corporation, is suing "WILLIS CARTO aka FRANK TOMPKINS aka E.L. ANDERSON, Ph.D.; HENRY FISCHER aka HENRI FISCHER; LIBERTY LOBBY, INC., a corporation; VIBET, INC., a corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, Inclusive."

At stake are some seven to eight millions of dollars. Maybe that's what Willis means when he writes that the bequest was "much less" than the "ten million" reported by The Los Angeles Times.

This is a struggle that has only begun. Who knows how much money is really at stake. If the inheritance was intended to go to Willis Carto, he should have it. If it was intended to go to The Legion for the Survival of Freedom (IHR and Noontide Press) then The Legion should have it. If some other entity was supposed to have it, they should get it.

The primary point to be clear about is that Willis Carto and The Legion for the Survival of Freedom are not the same entity. They are different entities. This is

what complicates the issue, as for years Carto has encouraged the understanding that he and the corporation are one and the same. They are not, so far as I know. If I'm mistaken, I suppose the court will rule in a way that will demonstrate that I am.

I will say up front that while I believe the "alleged" bequest was intended for IHR and the revisionist work that only IHR can do, I do not know what was in the mind of the lady who left the bequest and I have no way to find out. I can only hope that it will all be worked out properly in a court of law by persons who are trained to reveal the truth of such matters.

If the court decides that The Legion / IHR was the intended recipient, IHR could begin a publishing program beyond anything it has even considered in the past. If the court decides Willis should get the money, he can pour it back into some new racialist or conspiratorial campaign about which he claims to have privileged information that is too important to reveal to the public.

CARTO QUESTION #3) Does the "Polis" Decision Prove Carto is Wrong? The decision (18 November 93) by Judge Robert J. Polis of the California Superior Court ruled, shortly and sweetly, that "Carto's" board of directors was illegal and that The Legion's new board made up of John Curry, Fritz Berg and Andrew Allen is the legitimate board of directors for the Legion for the Survival of Freedom, Inc. It's simply the law of the land. Carto has a lot of complaints about the decision and about Judge Polis. It's up to Willis to have the decision reversed. I'm told it isn't likely.

Willis claims that "his" board resigned because they were "threatened" and "cajoled" into resigning by IHR staff. It's true. That's how these things work. Threats of legal action terrified the Carto board into resigning because its members understood that, following Willis's lead, they had failed for years to run the board according to the corporate law of the State of Texas. If the original board had the best interest of The Legion in mind, rather than the best interests of Willis Carto, it would have operated legally and staff would not have been able to force its resignation.

If you want a copy of Carto's 4-page letter, send a cease and I'll mail it to you.

Carl Hottelet. Carl is a friend and supporter of myself, The Institute, and Willis. He's closer to Willis and Elisabeth than he is to me. I remember having dinner or drinks with the Hottelets and others in Washington D.C. maybe four years ago where a good time was had by all. Other than that occasion, I don't believe we've been in company.

Carl is distressed by the way I expressed my annoyance with Willis in **SR #17,** and not being the retiring sort he has written me a 10-page, single-spaced letter expressing his annoyance and challenging me to answer a series of questions. He would like me to distribute the full letter to all my readers but I'm going to decline to do so, for various reasons. However, the full letter has already been published in Spotlight. If you don't read Spotlight and would like to read the letter for yourself, drop me a s.a.s.e. and I'll send it to you.

While much of what Carl covers is in Elisabeth's letter, his emphasis is different.

Carl notes that I never worked at IHR so that my reporting of what went on in IHR offices between Willis and staff is hearsay and "that from tainted sources." Carl hasn't worked at IHR either and has gotten his info the way I've gotten mine, though probably from fewer sources.

Carl writes that I didn't work for IHR until July of 1984 so I had no way of knowing first hand what went on before then. I was in regular contact with McCalden and the others beginning in the Spring of 1980. I remember the morning in the parking lot in front of the original offices, those that were to be destroyed by arson four years later, when McCalden told me he was going to leave IHR because of irreconcilable differences with Willis. There was no hint that he had been fired, and in fact he continued to work at the Institute for several more weeks.

Carl notes that I don't mention that two of The Journal editors have since died of AIDS, which I suppose implies a moral condemnation. I don't see dying of AIDS as a moral issue, and do not regard homosexuality in itself as a moral issue. Homosexuals have enough problems in human society without their being attacked by the morality police.

Carl and Willis both are concerned with Tom Marcellus and another employee being Scientologists. Tom was always completely open about being a Scientologist and liked to talk Scientology when we had the time. Willis knew Tom was a Scientologist when Tom was first hired, when he was made Director of IHR a couple years later, when he quit in 1985, and when he was rehired in 1987. Now I'm supposed to be worried because Tom is a Scientologist. Maybe I'm an innocent, but I'm not worried.

With regard to what Scientologists believe, I don't understand what could be stranger than what is believed by Catholics, evangelicals or Mormons. We are a people saturated through and through with religious cults and beliefs. Why pick out this one for special opprobrium? Particularly in this instance. I've known Tom now going on to 15 years and he appears to be considerably saner and cleaner than those who attack him over his religious beliefs.

With regard to the "Edison bequest," Carl writes that an "employer's financial affairs are outside the legitimate concern of his employees." This is precisely where Carl goes wrong. My guess is that since he gets his information about "The Problems" by hearsay, that is from Willis rather than from the relevant documents, that he is still under the impression that The Legion is somehow a privately owned company, that Willis Carto owns it and is its chief executive, and that IHR staff are his employees. Not true.

NOT TRUE!

The Legion for the Survival of Freedom (IHR / Noontide Press) is a Texas corporation. It has a board of directors. That's how corporations are managed. Willis used to be an agent for the board. He no longer is. He was fired. Staff are employees of IHR/Noontide, not of Willis. There was a public pretense for years that Willis "owned" IHR. That's because "his" board forwarded the pretense. His board is gone with the wind. Willis is gone with the wind.

This is all the room I have for THE PROBLEMS this issue. There is a lot more in Carl's letter. Send a s.a.s.e. and I'll send you the full 10-page letter.

But right not I have some information that is too interesting and too important to let it go until next issue.

RENEGADE RADIO! HOLOCAUST REVISIONISM LIVE ON TALK RADIO!

Toward the end of June I received a telephone call from a man identifying himself as Executive Producer for W.A.L.E.-AM in Providence RI. He introduced himself as Musa Kalimullah and asked if I would be interested hosting my own radio talk show on W.A.L.E. He wasn't offering me a job, but wanted to sell me air time at $200 an hour.

My first reaction was to think he'd called the wrong guy. But he knew exactly who I am and what I do. $200 is about what I pay to place an ad in a student newspaper on a college campus. I was familiar with W.A.L.E., I'd done half a dozen interviews on the station beginning in 1989. It's an AM station with a 50,000 watt signal. It's a real station. It's signal covers the entire state of Rhode Island, eastern Connecticut and southern Massachusetts, up to but not including metropolitan Boston.

The story appears to be that W.A.L.E. ownership made a decision to go to a an all-talk format and is having difficulty finding stimulating talkers, which translates into difficulty in building a listening audience. The station was looking for controversy. They turned to me.

All I had to do was find $2,600 to cover the first 13 weeks of broadcasting, develop a structure for the show, line up a number of guests, and hope the ADL or AJC or the SWC or some other such watchdog organization didn't pull the rug out from under me. One supporter volunteered to cover the entire bill for the first 13 weeks.

I didn't really believe I would be allowed to get the first program on air. After the first broadcast went off without a hitch I expected the axe to fall before it was time to do the second. I expected a scandal beyond anything I've seen on radio in the last ten years. There wasn't a peep from any quarter. I thought my friends at the *Anti-Defamation League might* be asleep at the switch. Then I thought, How can that be? Those watch dogs *never sleep!*

My first broadcast as host of my own radio talk show took place on Tuesday, 12 July from 12 noon to 1pm. That has been the weekly routine since. My guest on the first show as David Cole, of "David Cole Interviews Dr. Franciszek Piper" video fame. We had a good time and got a lot of information out, uninterrupted by cat calls from callers or a disingenuous host. We had our own show and we did it our own way. It went so well I invited David back to guest on the second program, thinking maybe we could be a team.

While the second program on 19 July went as well as the first, afterwards I felt something was missing. I decided to go on to other guests. Program number three featured Dr. Robert Countess. Program number four introduced Fritz Berg. We didn't finish with our material so Fritz returned for a second interview.

While listening to a cassette recording of my second interview with Fritz I realized something was still missing. It was hard to pin-point what the problem was. It wasn't Fritz. What was missing was the tension that is *produced by a debate in which two sides of a* story are being forwarded. What was missing from my show was an "opponent." Someone to represent the "other" side in the debate.

Charles Provan came to mind. He's the only exterminationist I know who has been willing to debate revisionists in public. In addition to being willing to debate he's a (more than) willing talker, he's industrious and has done a lot of research. He doesn't get hysterical when he's challenged, he's good-willed by nature and he's a friend. I called Charles, told him about the show, about the interviews with Fritz, and one of us suggested that Charles call in to the show while I was interviewing Fritz for the third time. He did, and the exchange between he and Fritz made program #5 the most interesting of the first five.

It was then I had a genius idea. Maybe Provan would be my regular guest. That would insure a pro & con exchange during every broadcast. I'm supposed to be doing *radio*, not a revisionist lecture series. People who listen to talk radio don't tune in to be lectured but to be entertained. Debate entertains in a way that lecturing never will. Debate is the heart and soul of talk radio. Debate on an important, controversial subject is perfect for talk radio.

Meanwhile, I was worried about Musa Kalimullah. When the ADL and the rest of the pack fell on his neck, would he stand or fall? Musa said not to worry. He wants the controversy. W.A.L.E. *needs* the controversy. Don't worry, Musa says. We're with you all the way, Bradley. When the trouble comes, we're going to take care of you. We'll hold you in our arms like a new-born babe. That's how he talks. Then he laughs. At first I thought Musa might be an Arabian of some sort. But when Musa laughs, and he's laughing more and more, he sounds increasingly like one of our Black brothers. An American. So the plot thickens!

W.A.L.E. has a strong signal but a weak listening audience. The hope is that I can help build its audience. But the dreaded Holocaust Lobby is playing possum. I'm very disappointed with its performance this time around. The Lobby is giving me the old silent treatment. It occurs to me that while the ADL and its sister organizations have a heavy clout with the print press, that may not be so with radio. The print press is establishment from top almost to bottom. Radio is a loose collection of loose cannons. When talkers get the bit between their teeth they're unstoppable. This caper may be the one that puts the fear of G-d into the Lobby.

Meanwhile, I'm learning how to put a talk show together. I've completed seven weekly shows as of this writing. There's more to it than just talking. Being interviewed is one thing. Interviewing others is something else. Now the fall semester is upon us. College campuses will soon be full of students and professors again. *My natural audience.*

This talk radio adventure on W.A.L.E. faces three serious obstacles.

1) The attack from the Holocaust Lobby when it comes. Maybe W.A.L.E. can stand up to it and maybe it can't. Musa called only yesterday to say that he has received the first call from the Jewish press. The Jewish Week in New York City. Reporter Rob Goldblum called to ask if Musa did not understand that I am a notorious "denier?" Musa tells me he said yes, isn't it wonderful that we live in a country where both sides of a story can be told.

2) I have to develop a listening audience, which I believe at the moment is small. I air live from 12 noon to 1pm, and we get few call-ins.

3) I have to raise the money to buy the time. $200 per show. $2,600 for a 13 week stint. The present stint ends on 4 October. If I can demonstrate that I have a substantial listening audience, I can bargain with W.A.L.E. for a better deal. Until I do, I can't.

Cassette recordings are available for each of the programs I've completed. Please be certain that your donation covers the costs of duplicating and postage.

#1 (12 July) Guest is David Cole.
#2 (19 July) Guest is David Cole.
#3 (26 July) Guest is Robert Countess.
#4 (2 Aug) Guest is Fritz Berg.
#5 (9 Aug) Guest is Fritz Berg.
#6 (16 Aug.) Guest is Fritz Berg
(Charles Provan calls in)
#7 (23 Aug) Guest is Charles Provan.

SMITH'S REPORT is sent free to those of you who help with contributions, relevant press clippings or in other ways. I read all correspondence but can not reply to it unless it treats with important current business. If you do not want your name to appear in this newsletter, please say so in writing. Your help is much appreciated, and is what underlies the successes we are having in taking revisionist theory to the campus and to media.